

# **P L A N N I N G   C O M M I S S I O N**

## **ACTION MINUTES**

**TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 2005**

Chair Parsons called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m., One Twin Pines Lane, Second Floor, City Hall.

### **1.      ROLL CALL:**

Present, Commissioners:      Parsons, Dickenson, Frautschi, Gibson,  
Long, Wozniak, Horton

Absent, Commissioners:      None

Present, Staff:      Community Development Director de Melo  
(CDD), Associate Planner Walker (AP), City Attorney Zafferano (CA),  
Recording Secretary Flores (RS)

Chair Parsons extended congratulations to Carlos de Melo on his appointment to the position of Community Development Director.

**2.      AGENDA AMENDMENTS:**      None

**3. COMMUNITY FORUM (Public Comments):** None

**4. CONSENT CALENDAR:**

**4A. Minutes of August 16, 2005 and October 4, 2005 Planning Commission Meetings**

**MOTION:** By VC Dickenson, seconded by D Long, to accept the Action Minutes of Tuesday, October 4, 2005 as presented.

**Ayes:** Dickenson, Horton, Frautschi, Gibson, Long, Wozniak, Parsons

**Noes:** None

**Motion passed 7/0.**

CDD de Melo stated that the Minutes of August 16, 2005 will be available for the meeting of November 15, 2005

**5. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**5A. PUBLIC HEARING - 2606 Belmont Canyon Road**

To consider a Single Family Design Review and Floor Area Exception for a 915 square foot addition to the existing 2,230 square-foot single-family residence for a total of 3,145 square feet that is greater than the maximum permitted 2,009 square feet for this site. (Appl. No. 2005-0035)

APN: 043-181-040; Zoned: R-1B/S-1 (Single Family Residential)

CEQA Status: Recommended Categorical Exemption per Section 15301

Applicant/Owner: Kate Leggett

AP Walker summarized the staff report, recommending approval.

C Wozniak: Questioned what the height of the LR was from floor to ceiling and will check with the architect for determination. Do the changes in the parking ordinance apply? CDD de Mel This address is in compliance with the zoning ordinance (complying garage and driveway) for S1 district.

Chair Parsons: Identified that the reading room extension is not contained within the footprint of the building and increases the bulk of the house.

Kate Leggett, applicant: Explained that they bought the house 10 years previously, family is expanding, husband and wife both have home offices, conference calls taken currently in the garage, in-laws stay extended time, close ties to neighbors, would rather expand the house than move.

Jerry Perveka, Architect: The LR is 1-1/2 stories high, or 12 feet. This upgrade makes sense to utilize unused space; the house is unattractive from the street, makes logical sense from a land use point.

Chair Parsons: How are you going to drive the footing down? J Perveka: Use a portable drilling rig adding 5' heights/extensions as needed.

**MOTION: By C Gibson, seconded by C Long, to close the public hearing. Motion passed.**

C Gibson: This is a Floor Area Exception, not a Floor Area Variance. Basically within the building footprint. No view impairment. Intensification of use; more people; more cars? In favor of project.

C Long: Believe this is a clean case, reasonable request, use spare space underneath, no privacy or view issue, you have to look hard for intensification (home office and play use in accordance with Belmont values), interesting. Supports the project.

C Horton: No issues. Remember to use your garage for cars. It would be good to clean up items that are out of compliance.

C Frautschi: 41% increase in floor area. Right and left yard setbacks and height are non-conforming. Zoning ordinance; welfare of the community; decision that runs the course of the house. Increased bulk, increase size assumes increased use, if not this owner, future owners. Increased intensification. Bulk is not only mass and FAR but total increase/intensification not only for now but for the future. 280 sq. ft. outside of existing footprints; increasing bulk. Felt this addition is too much. Would vote to continue for redesign; not for approval.

C Wozniak: Family wants more room. There are no triggers on parking additions. Agreed with C Frautschi that they would be approving the house for whoever lives in it for the future. Not for/against; needed to listen more.

Chair Parsons: Concerned about bulk. It has some odd spaces with the room in the back that has no windows. It's a larger addition than code allows. In favor of some addition but not sure that it should be 915 sq ft.

**MOTION: By C Dickenson, seconded by C Long to approve the Floor Area Exception and Single Family Design review for 2606 Belmont Canyon Rd (Appl. 2005-0035)**

**Ayes: Dickenson, Long, Horton**

**Noes: Frautschi, Gibson, Wozniak, Parsons**

**Motion Denied: 4/3**

After further discussion, CDD de Melo summarized direction to applicant to include problem with bump-out for reading room, too intense for the site based on a floor area perspective, do not want to increase the bulk of the house, house less than 3000 sq.ft.

**MOTION: By C Frautschi, seconded by C Gibson, to continue for redesign the Floor Area Exception and Single Family Design Review for 2606 Belmont Canyon Rd for applicant to bring back project less intense, less bulk, under 3000 sq. ft., within the existing pilings of the house permitting for the front deck area and removal of the structures on the side. (Appl. 2005-0035)**

**Ayes: Frautschi, Gibson, Wozniak, Parsons**

**Noes: Long, Horton, Dickenson**

**Motion Passed: 4/3**

**5B. PUBLIC HEARING – 2812 Wakefield Drive**

**To consider a Conditional Use Permit to construct a 215 square foot patio enclosure addition at the rear of the existing single-family residence. (Appl. No. 2005-0049)**

**APN: 045-441-340; Zoned: PD (Planned Development)**

**CEQA Status: Recommended Categorical Exemption per Section 15301**

**Applicant/Owner(s): Dana and Christine Louie**

CDD de Melo summarized the staff report, recommending approval.

C Gibson: If R1, would this have been approved administratively? CDD De Mel Yes, if R1, permit only would be needed.

Christine Louie, Applicant: The deck was existing. They obtained a permit for dry rot and her husband had a stroke about that time. Advised that they could do his therapy at home. That is what most of the space is used for. The deck was 240 sq. ft., less what they cut off for dry rot; is now 215 sq. ft.

**MOTION: By Commissioner Frautschi, seconded by Commissioner Long, to close the public hearing. Motion passed.**

Chair Parsons: Stated for the record that he has known Dana and Christine Louie for about 10 years or longer, adding that he does not live within 500' of them and does not have a financial interest in this project.

**MOTION: By Commissioner Frautschi, seconded by Commissioner Dickenson, for a Resolution to approve a Conditional Use Permit to amend an approved Detailed Development Plan at 2812 Wakefield Dr., with Exhibit A appended. (Appl. 2005-049)**

**Ayes: Frautschi, Gibson, Long, Horton, Wozniak, Dickenson, Parsons**

**Noes: None**

**Motion Passed: 7/0**

## **6. NEW BUSINESS**

### **6A. Preliminary Design Review - Two Proposed Single Family Dwellings – 3000 Block of Ralston Avenue (Southside) (Appl. No. 2005-0042)**

CDD de Melo summarized the staff report. Three basic questions:

- Is proposed land use appropriate for the site?
- Is the proposed intensity of land use appropriate for the site?
- Is the arrangement or distribution of land use appropriate for the site?

C Wozniak: Access from Ralston Avenue? CDD de Mel Applicant will seek agreement with Mid Peninsula Water District for access, to extend and widen existing driveway.

Leonard Triano, Applicant and General Contractor and Real Estate broker from Monterey: The preliminary plan was the thought of former CDD Ewing. They acquired 4 legal building lots. Maximum slope 40%, lots 1 & 2; maximum slope 44% lots 3 & 4. Density too tight for 4 houses. They want to merge lots 1 & 2, and lots 3 & 4. Looking at Tuscan type homes, 3500 sq. ft., terraced, with guest facility.

C Gibson: Sewer service? Applicant: In street on Ralston.

Chair Parson: Will you need a road in back, with retaining walls?

Applicant: Yes, reason for combining lots.

Chair Parson: Cut/fill for road? Tony Ponterio, A/P Consulting Engineers: More feasibility, need to increase width of road leading up to water tanks for fire truck standards, based on ordinances for retaining wall heights. More detailing to do.

C Gibson: Is the current road 15' wide? Acceptable to fire department? Tony Ponteri The road will need to be improved all the way up the hill and will be 20' wide. Applicant gave Mid Pen a deposit to do their own geo technical engineering for feasibility to put that road up there.

C Gibson: Little lots, residential 5-13 lots, with road cut through the lots? CDD de Mel Lots 5-13 are owned by Mid Pen.

Tony Ponteri We walked the site. The road can be widened. It will require a 3-5' high retaining wall or cut the road on the inside.

C Frautschi: Clarify the easement; the road will be widened to 20' for fire all the way down to Belmont Canyon Rd.? Tony Ponterio Yes.

C Gibson: This will not be a dedicated street, maintained by Mid Pen?

Tony Ponteri This will be a private road maintained with an HOA agreement.

C Long: R1E corridor ratio, floor area ratio?



C de Mel 2 key sections of code:

- Minimum lot size of 1 acre (project site in total is 1.6 acres)
- Section 9.3, sub-standard lots in relation to R1E

If slope is correct, fall within parameters.

Staff needs direction to work with applicant.

C Frautschi: R1E standards apply to this property, all setbacks. Up to 4500 sq. ft, but already sub-standard lots. I cannot support 3500 sq. ft. houses on the lots. Consider this is a ridge site. We have strict site lines rules. Is there an appearance the house is on the ridge line? We no longer allow that. A scenic corridor. We pay particular attention to houses that can be seen from Ralston. The project should address the water district easement land. The impact, EIR? Drainage into the watershed? Pay particular attention to cut and fill. The less hauling the better, the less digging the better. Do the location of a major city entrance and on a scenic roadway, landscaping frontage should be a condition. Clustering to preserve most of the land is desirable.

C Wozniak: This is a pretty difficult site from a topography stand point. Need to meet setback requirements.

C Dickenson: I agree with C Frautschi except 3500 sq. ft. rule.

C Wozniak: Scenic corridor issues, appearance from road, work with site, hug the land.

C Gibson: Previous retaining wall collapsed in 1982-83. Pay careful attention to geo tech issues.

C Long: Open space is always preferred on the Ralston Scenic Corridor. I am prepared to approve a reasonable project on this lot. Ralston Scenic Corridor has a high standard. There is unwritten goodwill, on the Ralston Scenic Corridor, proper landscape and trees, the less cut and fill the better. I want to see as little of the house from Ralston as possible. Give the house 'curb appeal'. I could support a house less than 3500 sq. ft. with a clever designs.

Chair Parsons: Concern about access to the site and work with the fire department. I would like to see a balanced cut and fill, very sensitive to retaining walls and look of retaining walls. We are sensitive to flat house on a hill. Need to step a house down the hill. Tie the walls into the house. I have no objection to houses built up there. No variances, no special exceptions; height issues. We have an ordinance that we do not want houses to project above the ridgeline.

C Dickenson: As far as a second in-law unit, we are very sensitive to that. If you can incorporate it into the single family design.

## **7. STUDY SESSION**

### **7A. Downtown Urban Planning / "Transforming El Camino Real"**

CDD de Melo introduced the first stage of MTC grant around the Belmont Cal Trans station.

Terry Bottomly, Bottomly Design & Planning: Working with Sam Trams, the cities of Belmont, San CDD de Melo and Redwood City. This is a grant administered by Sam Trams from the Transportation of Livable Communities Program. Checking in with 3 communities; current policies, recommendations that they have adopted with respect to the Peninsula Corridor Plan (PCP), and reviewing the existing on-the-ground

conditions. (¼ to ½ mile on either end of the stations) Looking for defined recommendations for the project.

From the grant, major objectives:

- Promote a smart growth corridor, linking transportation with economic development
- Improve access to Cal Train station areas (improving pedestrian access)
- Expand non-auto circulation throughout the corridor
- Enhance visual quality and image

Will have 3 meetings in each community by next spring and then get into the granting cycle for a capital grant.

Goals for Belmont from the PCP:

- Train station should be a community public space on both sides (El Camino Real and Old County Rd.)
- Crossings should be improved along El Camino Real
- Green buffer or edge on east side of El Camino along frontage parking area
- Widen/upgrade/repair sidewalks on both sides of El Camino Real
- Lanes at El Camino Real narrowed to allow for wider sidewalks and to create pedestrian refuges at medians in the street
- Bus stops and shelters to be improved, generally

All communities and transit agencies are grappling with El Camino all the way down to San Jose.

Will be producing schematic designs for improvements for the 3 different cities (bulb outs, cost estimates).

Study area is 3000' in length, from U-Haul in the north to O'Neill.

Trying to map:

- Pedestrian facilities on the streets (where intersections are, crosswalks)
- Curbside parking, is or isn't

Pedestrian crossings a key item. ECR and Ralston daunting, a challenge to cross the street to the train station. What is the level of service? Traffic issues. Is a double L turn from Ralston S to ECR needed? What about refuges, bulb outs for pedestrian? Use piano key striping; more visible. What is the length of crosswalks, treatment of crosswalk surface, enough crosswalks? There is a stretch of ¼ mile with no crosswalks. Stationary parking is a reservoir for frontage businesses across the street. Need a safe way to cross the street. Getting along the street is about the sidewalk conditions which vary a lot. Building setback not as much a constraint here as in other communities. Sidewalks could use improvement for buffering; trees, lights (like in front of Peets). Need furnishings, amenities, planting strip in some area where there is excess street width.

Old County Rd:

- Very narrow sidewalks on the W side
- Better sidewalk on the E side
- E side, better bldg set back, amenities along sidewalk(improvements made)

ECR:

- Narrow sidewalks (PCP looked as ECR as boulevard with wide sidewalks)
- Sidewalks overwhelmed by width of street
- Dense median to the North
- Belmont constrained; does not have frontages
- Most pedestrian friendly clustered around the hub of the station
- Sidewalks not wide enough to allow for a bus shelter (even where there have been improvements)

Access thru the Station:

- PCP recommended better lighting, perception of pedestrian safety

Check-in to PCP original recommendations? New ideas?

Chair Parsons: Improvements to Ralston and ECR need to be taken back to 6<sup>th</sup> Street to allow for transition. At HOA meeting, CCAG had its own recommendations.

T. Bottomly: CCAG and Cal Trans are check-ins for us as we go forward. We will work with both of them to address the issues. Standards from Cal Trans as to what they will accept.

Corrine Goodrich, San Trans Project Mgr: Working with CCAG on a smart growth corridor planning/funding. Need to look at this as integrated corridor management.

Chair Parsons: Public Works has a project to take out trees on Ralston between 6<sup>th</sup> and ECR. CDD de Mel Yes, buy in from everyone needed. Will put Mr. Bottomly in touch with PW personnel. RDA funds for Old County Rd. What is the conflict? Does this flow together?

Corrine Goodrich): Wind a problem on Ralston and ECR. The S side of the platform has a parking lot; sterile. Only a couple of ways to get up to the platform. Rain shelters? Bullet train blows you over when it comes through. Need more spaces to cross ECR. No place to safely cross between Ralston and Ausiellos' Tavern. Need to be more pedestrian friendly.

C Long: Problem with illegal crossings. L turn lanes overkill going N. Need R turn lane on Ralston to S bound ECR. CCAG different song sheets.

C Gibson: Traffic on Ralston, cannot reduce capacity on Ralston or ECR without a revolt. Bulb outs in San Carlos more dangerous.

C Horton: Getting traffic through on Ralston, at speed limit, always a problem. No way to cut across town. If we could get people to Harbor.

T. Bottomly: Ralston and ECR a pedestrian refuge; reconfigure crosswalk. Similar issues at Holly and Whipple.

C Dickenson: There was talk about widening sidewalk and diagonal parking on S ECR.

C Frautschi: How much is the grant? T Bottomly: \$68,000 - \$90,000

C Frautschi: Capital grant? Some matching grants. A couple of things to think about:

- Reduce width of ECR
- Parking now on S Side?
- In September, PG&E will start under-grounding of power lines on Old County Rd from Harbor to the N end of Old County to SM border, paving and minor sidewalk improvements
- Recent trend to increase speed limit on Ralston and head to freeway
- Too much concrete – Menlo Park has narrow road and trees
- Cal Train insisting on not reducing our service – basically, the train doesn't stop here anymore
- Race track properties - what traffic might be thrown our direction
- \$4.5M major grant for bicycle bridge crossing 101 – Sterling Downs neighborhood
- Larger pedestrian area, bulb outs did not work in residential areas
- 70% of traffic on Ralston is Belmont's

- Discourage people to speed through town
- Space under tunnel – café?
- Park and Rec Plaza Plan, \$1.5M

C Dickenson: High speed rail from L.A.? Corrine Goodrich): Has been on ballot for a couple of years. A four track system (express, high-speed, and local). Ridership increased since baby bullet.

C Frautschi: Cal Train should release property if they are not going to serve Belmont. Cal Train getting more money. Corrine Goodrich: Better service in the future.

C Dickenson: Not getting ridership from Oracle? C Frautschi: Oracle takes shuttle to San Carlos.

Corrine Goodrich stated that high-speed a long time away.

C Dickenson: Bicycle bridge in near future....talk to Oracle.

CDD de Mel Will meet with Mr. Bottomly and staff and get back to you.

## **8. REPORTS, STUDIES, UPDATES AND COMMENTS**

CDD de Mel

- Ralston Village going to City Council on 11/9.
- Holiday scheduled for Monday, 12/26 and Monday, 1/2

- Wendy's continued to next meeting

C Dickenson: Status of Sequoia tree, next to Wells Fargo? It is pulling up roots near the coffee place. CDD de Mel Will check and report back

Library tours on Saturday and Monday.

**9. PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
OF TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 2005**

Liaison: Commissioner Dickenson

Alternate Liaison: Commissioner Gibson

**10. ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m. to a regular meeting on Tuesday, November 15, 2005 at 7:00 p.m. at Belmont City Hall.

---

Carlos de Melo

Planning Commission Secretary



*CDs of Planning Commission Meetings are available for review*

*in the Community Development Department*

*Please call (650) 595-7416 to schedule an appointment.*